

Re-membering surrealism in Charles Henri Ford's Poem posters (1964–5)

Article (Accepted Version)

Pawlik, Joanna (2018) Re-membering surrealism in Charles Henri Ford's Poem posters (1964–5). *Art History*, 41 (1). pp. 154-191. ISSN 0141-6790

This version is available from Sussex Research Online: <http://sro.sussex.ac.uk/id/eprint/61704/>

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies and may differ from the published version or from the version of record. If you wish to cite this item you are advised to consult the publisher's version. Please see the URL above for details on accessing the published version.

Copyright and reuse:

Sussex Research Online is a digital repository of the research output of the University.

Copyright and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. To the extent reasonable and practicable, the material made available in SRO has been checked for eligibility before being made available.

Copies of full text items generally can be reproduced, displayed or performed and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

Re-membering Surrealism in Charles Henri Ford's *Poem Posters* (1964–5)

... and not read *View*

'You can't be modern and not read *View*' ran one promotional advertisement for the self-appointed modern magazine [Fig. 1]. Charles Henri Ford's influential *View* magazine (1940–7) is now a landmark on maps of surrealism's reception in America. Publishing visual and verbal material from the European surrealists during their war-time exile in New York alongside work from American writers, artists and commentators, the expensively produced publication confected a decidedly eclectic, commercial and queer identity for the movement.¹ Accompanying the slogan in the advert is a rather crudely rendered line drawing of a naked woman holding the spring 1944 issue with the front cover design by Alexander Calder, and the back cover featuring an advert for Calder's show at the Gallery Buchholz. She reads the publication, agog. The image implies that to be modern is coterminous with feminised reception, rather than masculinist production, of cultural forms; or more specifically, being seen to consume particular cultural forms. 'Modern' is linked to a lifestyle, a series of choices about what to read, how to wear one's hair, as well as to sexual uninhibitedness, rather than designating a particular place or moment in time. The form of the naked woman echoes the triangles on the magazine's cover, implying there is a degree of convergence between the reader and the magazine, both become modern, are contemporaneously realised, at the point of consumption, whenever and wherever that may be. The double negative in the statement performs ironic shock at someone deigning to think that *View* might not be as vanguard as it proposes, that one's modernity could very well be signalled otherwise, but it nonetheless delivers an instruction to future readers: read *View*!

It is perhaps an emerging truism as scholarly interest in the polymathic Ford grows, that 'You can't write about Ford and not write about *View*'. The magazine remains the locus of academic research on Ford, whose long and varied career in the arts spans the majority of the twentieth-century. Undoubtedly it is a significant publication, but its status as fetishized source of fascination in Ford has meant that it has often functioned as a terminus for interest in his work. What would happen if we did not start with *View* and instead return to *View* from points in the future? One *might*, as the advertisement implies, read *View* at any point and still be isomorphic with its contents. Reading *View*, being 'modern', is not located in a particular moment in time, it just designates a particular spectacle and erotics of embodied consumption.

This article explores how Ford's practice in the 1960s and 70s self-consciously continued *View*'s mission of promoting a queer and commercial version of surrealism. Focussing on his *Poem Posters* (1964–5), large off-set lithographic prints of famous figures from avant-garde and celebrity

circles, and his “*Having Wonderful Time Wish You Were Here*”: *Postcards to Charles Henri Ford* exhibition at the Iolas Gallery (New York, 1976), it considers Ford’s efforts to embed surrealism within the contexts of pop and later mail art [Fig. 2]. The article draws on scholarship on queer temporalities to argue that Ford’s anachronistic recourse to surrealism, long after the movement was widely held to have expired, aligns disruption of sequential accounts of avant-gardism with a recalculation of the movement’s customary heteronormativity.² In short, Ford generates queer erotic capital from surrealism’s status as outmoded. In Ford’s historiography of the surrealist avant-garde, the movement is not consigned to the past, to be negatively or ironically invoked by subsequent generations, but is a heterogeneous, renegade presence that is irreducible to ‘itself’ as customarily periodised, spatialised, gendered or sexualised.

Ford’s long career began as teenager, while still living with his parents in Mississippi, when he edited *Blues* magazine (1929–30), an audacious modernist publication that included Gertrude Stein, William Carlos Williams, Ezra Pound and H.D. amongst its contributors.³ He went on to co-author the novel *The Young and the Evil* (1933) with Parker Tyler which detailed their life in the gay subcultures of New York and is often cited as the first ‘gay novel’.⁴ Ford became acquainted with the salon of Gertrude Stein and Alice B. Toklas during his stay in Paris in the early 1930s and was subsequently affiliated with the surrealists. He endorsed their FIARI group (International Federation of Independent Revolutionary Writers) in 1939, a collaboration of European, and North and Latin American artists, writers and intellectuals intended to protect culture from the twin threats of Nazism and Stalinism, and he and Parker Tyler defended the movement in a letter, ‘Surrealist Protest’, published in *Partisan Review* in 1940. This challenged Louise Bogan’s essay in a previous issue on the deleterious influence of surrealism on the poet Paul Eluard’s ‘gifts’, which had, she argued, been ‘reduced to the level of a word game’ and ‘made to function under manifestoes, literary or otherwise’.⁵ Tyler and Ford argued that ‘Surrealism is not defined by a parlor game, a set of rules, or a psychotic type’, that it can accommodate heterogeneity and internal contradiction.⁶ This articulation of the congruency of loyalty and disobedience recurs in Ford’s practice and his accounts of his own position in relation to the movement, suggesting that surrealism itself supplies the means through which it might both challenged and renewed. He frequently rejected being an ‘an orthodox surrealist, because I never hued to the line’, but remained a fellow traveller throughout his career.⁷ The ‘line’ here refers less to surrealism’s political orthodoxy than to André Breton’s heteronormativity and homophobia, about which Ford had probed him on numerous occasions. Ford recalls his first conversation with Breton in which Ford was shocked at his [Breton’s] puritanism in the Sex Conference in *Variétés*, wherein he protested against discussing pederasty, so I bluntly said it must be because of an inhibition

and he agreed... I told him if I appreciated his lyricism inspired by “la femme” it was only because I substituted the symbol of the Other sex.⁸

The letter characterises Ford’s insistence on the mutability of the erotics of surrealism, as well as the equivocal nature of Breton’s ‘authority’ over them, which his practice in the following decades would exploit.

It was not just launching surrealism in America to which Ford laid claim: he frequently repeated to friends that he was the first to publish Allen Ginsberg in an avant-garde context, and his connections with other writers associated with the beat generation were extensive and productive, not least with Ted Joans, William Burroughs, Paul Bowles and Philip Lamantia.⁹ Similarly, he was prone to mention, in testimony which inscribes himself as an accessory to some of pop’s primal scenes in the early 1960s, that he was with Andy Warhol when he bought his first camera, and that he introduced Warhol to Gerard Malanga and Jack Smith.¹⁰ Ford reacted enthusiastically to pop in his *Poem Posters*, as well as his artist’s book *Spare Parts* (1966), and *Silver Flowers Coo* (1968). By exploiting the iconography of advertising and desire, these works explored the confluence of pop and surrealism and fostered new genealogies for both.¹¹ Ford would develop his interest in film; his *Johnny Minotaur* (1971), which featured voice-overs from Salvador Dalí and Ginsberg, emerged as a cult classic of queer cinema. He held a weekly salon in New York during the 1970s, at which proto-punk avant-gardists such as Patti Smith and emerging artists such as Robert Mapplethorpe were regular attendees, who comingled with Ford’s longstanding friends and acquaintances such as the surrealist artist and writer Leonora Carrington.¹²

Ford was present at moments from a checklist of landmarks in twentieth century vanguard cultural history. These are customarily non-congruent moments according to conventional place-markers that separate modernism from postmodernism, avant-gardism from neo-avant-gardism. His participation in these scenes as artist, writer or film-maker is inseparable from his roles as editor, patron, curator, commentator, translator, reviewer, as well as friend, confident, lover and even adversary. Ford’s practice engages with these other forms of cultural labour which control the rhythms and spacing of cultural history and supply a means through which he interrogates and manipulates the chronology and temporality of the cultural historical record. The personal friendships that sustain the cultural field are also embedded in the gossipy and affective exhibitions *Poem Posters* and *Wish you were here*, which present an embodied version of cultural history, casting it as much a collision of ideas and forms, as of queerly desiring bodies and their cultural interlocutors.

Erotica of all sorts

Ford's *Poem Posters* show opened at the Cordier & Ekstrom Gallery on May 18th 1965. Some posters were shown the year before in Mexico City, as well as being reproduced in black and white, under the title 'Some Spare Parts', in the little magazine *Residu*, edited by Daniel Richter, running out of Athens in the spring of 1965 [Fig. 3]. The posters, off-set lithograph prints, featured figures from the so-called historical avant-garde and its successors, as well as the occasional social and mythical celebrity, who were layered over poems collaged from fragments of newspapers, magazines and advertisements. Ford called them 'Hommage [sic] Posters' to 'lots of ... Beautiful People', including Allen Ginsberg, Claus Oldenburg, Irving Rosenthal, Marcel Duchamp as Rrose Selavy (as Pope Joan), Gerard Malanga, W.H. Auden, Ted Joans, Jayne Mansfield, as well as Ford himself.¹³ [Fig. 4] Arne Ekstrom was expecting 'portraits of other artists of note and figures in the public eye', but instead the individual posters eschew the model of a unique portrait of a singular individual at a particular moment in time, and instead often feature multiple figures layered over one another, and many figures recur across a number of the posters.¹⁴ Further exploiting the protean medium of offset printing using several plates, Ford produces different versions of the posters, overlaying different combinations or rotations of figures over different verbal texts. One poster, for instance, combines images of Ginsberg, Mansfield and another figure, over the text of the poem about Ginsberg [Fig 5]. The multiple iterations of these palimpsestic, polymorphous *Poem Posters* make a common goal of formal, temporal and sexual promiscuity; they view the cultural past, present and future through a kaleidoscope of shifting permutations and possibilities.

Ford directed a film (1966) depicting the opening of the *Poem Posters* show at which William Burroughs, Andy Warhol, Gerard Malanga, Edie Sedgwick, Frank O'Hara, Jack Smith and James Rosenquist, amongst other 'Beautiful people' attended. He added a soundtrack of jazz, brief narration of events and a reading of some of the poems from the posters. The film focusses on the reception of the works, privileging the eroticised spectacle of their consumption by paralleling the arrival of the guests and the arrival of the works, whose transportation to and from, and hanging in, the gallery are carefully recorded. As the vanguardists and social celebrities in the film brush shoulders and mingle with one another, they do so with the figures from the past and present in the posters, who are sometimes one and the same person: Mansfield appears on and in both. The geometric haircuts of guests, their elaborate makeup and patterned clothes further conflate them with the silk-screened screened images, which are also characterised by bold contrast and stylised fashions. Both film and exhibition depict frissons between bodies from multiple generations on multiple screens as part of the process of making and recording, or re-recording, cultural history. The gallery may well legitimate the work of art as such, but as the film's lingering

shots of flirtatious activity and sexual practices both within and on its walls attest, it is equally part of the mis-*en-scène* of (queer) erotic capital as well.

‘Andy [Warhol] had already done Marilyn Monroe’, Ford later recalled, positioning his images of iconic social and artistic figures as both a response to, but also deviation from, Warhol’s practice.¹⁵ Ford’s posters’ combination of visual and verbal modes, as well as their reflection on the increasingly populous passage of cultural history through the recruitment of figures from both the cultural present and past set them apart from the serial images of the contemporary in Warhol’s work. They labour to position the tropes and thematics of pop art in a surrealist context, and the tropes and thematics of surrealism in a pop context. Pop, here, provides a space not, as Foster has argued, for an elaboration of their shared interest in the trauma of automation, but the fleshly, queer erotics of both.¹⁶ With working titles such as *Allen [Ginsberg] behind the Scenes, I WOULD LIKE TO CHANGE MY SEX AS I CHANGE MY SHIRT – André Breton*, and *The Ace of Spades is Me – Ted Joans*, the posters cater for an audience hungry for gossipy, salacious details about the intimate lives of artists and celebrities, mobilising a sexuality in excess of heteronormative erotics that likewise strains against linear, generational models of cultural history.¹⁷

The exhibition had been fraught with difficulty. Fearing the public reaction to a show that might accurately be dubbed ‘[e]rotica of all sorts and sexes’, the gallery, though sensitive to charges of censorship, had initially threatened to cancel it.¹⁸ Calas had written to Ford to say that the works seemed fit ‘to adorn the walls of the Hotel Cronos rather than a Madison Avenue Gallery’, suggesting instead that he exhibit ‘your straight portraits here... [and] leave those other orjies [sic] out’.¹⁹ Ford’s invocation of Duchamp appeared to be particularly problematic. Duchamp’s exhibition *Not seen and / or Less Seen of / by Marcel Duchamp / Rose Sélavy* had hung at the gallery in the months before Ford’s *Poem Posters*, and Calas fretted that Ford’s irreverent depiction of Duchamp threatened to undermine the gallery’s consolidation of his reputation in the 1960s art world. Duchamp, he writes, ‘did not seem at all pleased at your papesse jeanne idea’.²⁰ Calas responded to the surrealist context for the works, but rather than acknowledge Ford’s reprising of certain features of Breton’s movement as repetition with a difference, he writes that he fails ‘to see what reconsideration of images you introduce. This has all been said and done in Freudian anthologies of dreams’.²¹ Ford’s show seemed motivated by the very fact that this had *not* all been said and done in the Freudian anthologies of dreams which the Bretonian surrealists had publicised.

View as if it were View

In the years before the opening of the *Poem Posters* exhibition, *View* was on Ford's mind. He had plans afoot for a book about the magazine and he was fielding constant requests from friends to reprise the publication. After *View* had folded, Ford had spent time in France, Italy, Greece, and North Africa, returning sporadically to America.²² Back again in New York in 1962 Ford was instantly drawn to the burgeoning pop scene, becoming acquainted with Malanga, whom he introduced to Warhol.²³ '[T]his is the new surrealism', he later noted, adding 'I related immediately ... surrealism can take many forms'.²⁴ *View* seemed to offer a cultural space in which surrealism and pop could anachronistically commingle and collide. Ford was planning to publish his 'paste-up poems' in a portfolio of 100 bound and signed copies, under the imprint of New View Editions Athens, reprising the View Editions publishing venture he started in 1945, and inviting Tyler again as a partner.²⁵ Despite repeated requests, however, he did not revive the magazine per se but it continued to fuel and frame Ford's practice. It always was 'more than a little magazine', he noted: it was a brand, a platform that, he predicted in 1947, would live on as 'a symbol, a fire, an influence'.²⁶ It was left to others to reprise the publication. Malanga wrote to Ford in 1963:

Dear Charlie 'Pop' ... Andy and I are raising money for New View. We'll put out small mimeosheet under same name to introduce public to New View Publications ... I'm writing pop and cut-up poems and have decided to call the new decade of art and literature THE NEW VIEW.²⁷

They later, as described by Ford, 'put a bar between Inter/View and printed View as if it were View', the first issue of which came out six years after Malanga mentioned it to Ford.²⁸

That the 1960s might, according to Malanga, be dubbed 'the New View' is not difficult to explain. Writing about *View*, Tyler observed: 'We cover the arts, are lavishly illustrated and try to combine luxury with the avant-garde'.²⁹ This combination of commercialism and cultural vanguardism flouted the longstanding incommensurability between symbolic and economic capital in the field of restricted cultural production. The magazine was expensive to produce, featuring lavish colour covers by notable surrealist artists, and multiple colour, and black and white reproductions in its pages. The publication exploited lucrative collaborations with commercial galleries, sometimes serving as a veritable catalogue for shows that were running contemporaneously and they made no attempt to euphemise that the magazine needed money to run. Tyler notes that 'the advanced art galleries, regarding *View* as a legitimate publicity medium, collaborate with us by advertising ... anything stylish is *View* style except Abstract Expressionism ... No modish school of painting or sculpture is unrepresented in *View* if only because of the full-page advertisements that usually have large reproductions'.³⁰ This meant that despite the magazine's hostility to abstract expressionism, a Jackson Pollock painting was included on account

of advertising pressures rather than editorial selection. Ford and Tyler had little to say about abstract expressionism, whose rhetoric of heroic, heteronormative masculinity was at odds with the alternative models of gender and sexuality explored in *View*.

The magazine featured not just adverts from galleries, but from fashion and cosmetic companies as well, and although the advert design would not have been specially commissioned for *View*, as John Myers, then advertising manager, notes those promoting Helena Rubenstein were hand-picked by “Madame” herself, who was an admirer of *View*.³¹ These often featured sculptural perfume bottles and aphoristic quotations – “art knows no frontiers, beauty knows no limitations” – which served to further confuse distinctions between purveyors and consumers of lipsticks and works of art. Other tie-ins included a book shop, exhibitions at the offices, lavish parties, avant-garde soirees, puppet shows, jazz concerts, and masked balls, all sponsored financially and symbolically by *View*. Ford even sold shares in the magazine, prompting economic speculation on Ford’s symbolic capital, both of which, he never concealed, were required to further the magazine.

In a rather prescient review of early issues of *View* in February 1941, Clement Greenberg charged Ford’s publication with promoting a vulgar American variety of the already waning European surrealist movement: “From it [*View*] we gather ... that the American species identifies literature and art with its social life, and this social life is complicated and satisfying. The gossip is good if you know the names.”³² In its early guise as the *Poetry Paper*, the publication had actively courted “Travel, Hearsay, the Criminal Courts, the Metropolitan Midway, or anything else that you might think of, making explicit its interest in the vernacular, the scandalous and the outré.”³³ Ford had made this not only a feature of his editorial ethos but a virtue, writing to Greenberg in February 1941 to say that: ‘My slogan is: Public justice for private speech’.³⁴ The magazine had made a feature of its interviews with important literary and artistic figures, including one with Wallace Stevens in the first issue of the magazine as *View* (Sept. 1940), provocatively titled ‘Has the mystery Man of Modern poetry really another self?’ and another with Breton, newly arrived in New York, in which the leader of the movement respond to questions both obtuse and impudent: ‘Have you ever dreamed of Hitler’ (October-November 1941) [Fig. 6]. Surrealism’s commitment to the interiority of the individual psyche is here aligned with the gossip press’s pursuit of tattle and sleaze about the stars of stage and screen. A near full-page feature in issue one, ‘Reports and Reporters’, relays details about *View*’s staff, associates and enemies, ranging from information about new appointments, recent arrivals to the city, letters sent, telegraphs received, as well reference to fellow editor James Laughlin’s purchase of a new bicycle.³⁵

The pleasures and politics of gossip continued to motivate Ford's practice; the *Poem Posters* traffic in gossip, pasting on posters allusions to not only the sex life of artists but, as we shall see, the intimate lives of artworks too, in ways that figure gossip as part of the works' enquiry into the criterion of legibility and visibility in the official art historical record. Some of the gossip and scandal relates to the *View* era, such as the poster, featuring a half-naked Philip Lamantia, who was once the teenaged editorial assistant of *View*. Other posters offer salacious remarks about Ford's more recent confidants, such as Allen Ginsberg, about whom one poem exhorts 'AMERICA, Meet one of the world's GIANT "QUEENS"', and Irving Rosenthal who features on a poster dubbed 'Seduced and Abandoned, Irving thinks of Mother'. Surrealism's own self-censorship – Breton's repudiation of queer erotics despite the movement's investment in the autobiographical and the rhetoric and thrill of non-conformist desire – is exposed and lifted. Surrealism is restored to offering the idiom and syntax for the disclosure or elaboration of salacious details about the erotic lives of queer individuals: it is both the object of gossip in the *Poem Posters* as well as accommodating its queer, gossiping subject

Greenberg's comment suggests that gossip demarcates a particular circle - artistic, social or sexual - in which everyone knows the names. Indeed, *View* constantly attracted criticism for being a 'clique'. In his pioneering though problematic essay 'The Homosexual in Society', published in *Politics* magazine (1944), Robert Duncan, who had associated with Ford and the New York literary scene in the 1940s, expressed caution about what he deemed the 'cult of the homosexual' whose cultivation of 'a secret language, the camp, a tone and a vocabulary ... are loaded with contempt for the uninitiated'.³⁶ Ford actively claimed this cult identity, writing 'I'm glad *View* is being talked about as 'clique' organ – that's its purpose!³⁷ And it remained *View*'s purpose when its personnel and modus operandi were anachronistically reprised in Ford's practice in the 1960s. What passed between the mouths, bodies and pages of Ford's circle in the 1940s is re-animated on the screens of the posters, placing the magazine once again at the forefront of framing surrealism's reception as queerly anachronistic in the United States.

Coroner and Midwife

Ford's encounter with surrealism was, from the start, characterised by belatedness. He recalls in an unpublished autobiography that contrary to assumptions he had been at the 'red hot centre' of the surrealist movement during the 1930s, it had in fact 'already made history when [he] ... reached Paris'.³⁸ He adds elsewhere that he 'got the aftermaths' in France.³⁹ Ford's return to surrealism as editor of *View* during the 1940s occurs, then, *after* the aftermath. Surrealism, it was widely held by popular, middle and high brow commentators in the United States, had been extinct since the

1930s, if it had ever taken root and flourished at all. Surrealism as some kind of foreign body, and the movement's expiration, were popular tropes in the reception of the movement in America. This is despite, or perhaps because of, its incorporation into pantheons of modern art since the movement's earliest exhibition in the 1930s.⁴⁰ The pale young people who drink sherry at little tables and decide the latest vogues in art," ran one article in *Time* magazine in 1934, "were all finished with surrealism years ago."⁴¹ Its syntax of collage and fetishization of the female body were appropriated by commercial culture, and according to Herbert Muller writing in James Laughlin's *New Directions* anthology in 1940 'the only apparent influence of their art so far has been on fashionable advertisements and window-displays – on not the class struggle but the classy life'.⁴²

Surrealism seemed to represent the paradigmatic example of the diminishing distinction between commercialism and advanced art that was promoting widespread unease at mid-century about the very possibility of a politicised avant-garde.⁴³ The context of the Second World War brought new pressures as the historical avant-garde that had arisen in response to the First was tested in its adequacy to articulate the horrors of the Second. Surrealism's predilection for the irrational rendered it, according to some, uncomfortably proximate to fascism and its iconography of bodily fragmentation seemed to find sinister corollaries in the emerging images of war-time atrocities. "After the gas chambers," asked one commentator in 1947, "those heaps of bones and teeth and shoes and eyeglasses, what is there left for the poor Surrealists to shock us with?"⁴⁴ In his lecture to the students at Yale in 1942 Breton had to contend with the widely held view, put forward by 'impatient gravediggers', that 'surrealism is dead ... [it] is done for'.⁴⁵ Small wonder that in this context trying to revive surrealism in the pages of *VVV*, the surrealist group's official mouthpiece during its exile, was described by contributor Lionel Abel as requiring both 'coroner and midwife'.⁴⁶

Bretonian surrealism was, of course, far from finished at mid-century and the movement continued in Paris well into the 1960s, with a portfolio of activities including major international exhibitions in 1959 and 1965 and two publications, *La Breche* and *L'archibras*.⁴⁷ But it is the surrealism of the 1930s and 40s, of the *View* days in which Ford played an active part, that Ford reprise seeks to reprise; not in order to bury, but remember, to re-member. His return to surrealism in 1941 when he started *View*, at a time when to many it seemed as though the movement was in need of the care of others, not to mention his reiterations of these earlier reprises later in his career, might productively be read through Elizabeth Freeman's reflection on the queer politics of the non-synchronous. Freeman challenges the idea that to be queer is to be avant-garde, to be looking forward, and instead suggests that

the point may be to trail behind actually existing social possibilities: to be interested in the tail end of things, willing to be bathed in the fading light of whatever has been declared useless ... this cultural debris includes our incomplete, partial or otherwise failed transformations of the social field.⁴⁸

She is writing about responses in the visual arts during the 1990s and early twenty-first century to the perceived failures of the social and political revolutions of the 1960s and 70s, whose utopianism, identitarianism and collectivism seemed both anachronistic and yet somehow still germane to post-Stonewall, post-AIDS, post-Reagan contexts. Her supposition that there may be something queer about experiencing time as other than sequential, that being 'out of synch' can be suggestive of a challenge to reproductive futurity and the chrononormative regimes that regulate bodies towards optimum productivity, might shed light on Ford's own proclivity to '[c]ollect and remobilize detritus and debris', albeit in a different context.⁴⁹ Ford's continual recourse to the 'shrapnel' of the historical avant-garde's 'failed revolutions' invites reflection on what might have failed, how, and for whom, and how these failures might yet resonate in contexts that proceed it.

In the case of the surrealist avant-garde, its ambitions for social transformation were multiple, predicated on overturning capitalist and colonialist exploitation which were underpinned by the institutions of church, family and state. It was itself no stranger to making recourse to the non-synchronous as part of a strategy to historicise and relativise bourgeois self-understanding and legitimation.⁵⁰ Commenting on their fascination with the newly-extinct, the dilapidated and the destitute, Walter Benjamin noted in 1929 that the surrealists were the 'the first to perceive the revolutionary energies that appear in the "outmoded"',⁵¹ writing elsewhere that mobilising the outmoded was a way of making visible the 'wish symbols of the previous century' at the very point of their forfeiture.⁵² Benjamin isolated a method internal to surrealism that Ford harnessed to explore and redress surrealism's own track record of un-met promises, exploiting this critical lever if not for its revolutionary then certainly its queer potential.

Surrealism's 'failure' was often explained by its proximity to, or absorption by, the very social and political formations it sought to transform, the most problematic of which seemed to be its compatibility with commercial culture and its predilection for primitivist aesthetics. Ford seemed relatively unmoved by surrealism's anti-capitalist and anti-colonial stance; he was concerned more with its investigations into the politics and poetics of desire, even, or perhaps especially, as these were usually furthering heteronormative agendas. His returns to surrealism were prompted by an investment in its revolution of desire that was not as yet fully realised. Ford casts surrealism's proximity to commercial culture less as an a-symmetrical or parasitic relationship, but one that was mutually transformative, generative of new perspectives on the erotics and spectacle

of cultural production and consumption. In Ford's hands, surrealism appears as intrinsic, rather than prior, to the art world in 1960s in which the fault lines between the symbolic, economic and erotic were being worked over and redrawn. Ford's trafficking in anachronism in this context seems shorn of the anti-capitalist politics embedded in Freeman's model. There is no critique of capital per se, and yet his practice explores and exploits what Freeman terms the 'planned obsolescence built into "commodity-time"'; surrealism's outmoding provides the condition of possibility for its regeneration and the recalculation of its sexual currency in much queerer terms.⁵³

Freeman's concepts of erotohistoriography and temporal drag offer useful ways of modelling the tempo and spacing of Ford's continual returns to surrealism. Erotohistoriography's approach to the past, according to Freeman, 'does not write the lost object into the present, so much as encounter it already in the present, by treating the present itself as hybrid. And it uses the body as a tool to effect, figure, or perform that encounter'.⁵⁴ Like its cognate term, temporal drag, defined as 'the performance of anachrony', erotohistoriography explores how bodies experience, register and exploit temporal disjunction, in ways that make palpable what exceeds a sequential narrative of history.⁵⁵ Ford's practice and editorship explore and re-write cultural history as a function of bodily encounters, of queer pleasures, whether fantasied, rumoured, or forgotten, which were often recalled or made known through gossip and anecdote.

As Greenberg's review testifies, *View's* penchant for gossip was well-known and often derided. Gavin Butt has tracked the disruptive function of gossip, of informal face-to face conversation about the intimate lives of particular artists, in the 1950s and 60s, exploring gossip's role both '*in* history' and '*as* history'.⁵⁶ Gossip informed the reception and interpretation of art works, but its unverifiability might also, Butt argues, 'queer the very ways in which we might think of the evidential'.⁵⁷ Taking gossip seriously, then, promotes a mode of historiography that issues a challenge to the sanctioned, certifiable art historical record, to its methods of and monopoly over art historical accounting. Like the surrealists' reclamation of the outmoded which, as Foster suggests, opened up the lacuna and repressions in official history, gossip also challenges hegemonic historiography, carrying with it its own a post-facto temporality that insists on the saliency of the original event long after it occurred.⁵⁸ As an occulted mode of recounting often occulted personal and cultural histories, gossip is mobilised as part of Ford's erotohistoriography of surrealism. Gossip had animated the queer cultural practices, spaces and production that were sponsored by, and had sponsored, surrealism in North America since the 1940s, and their subsequent invocation, through gossipy artworks like the *Poem Posters* in the 1960s, continued to contest the movement's official history (and its status *as* history), as much as its iconography and vocabulary of heterosexual desire.

If, following Freeman, we might see Ford as undertaking a queer negotiation of the ‘politics of the gap’ between different avant-garde generations, this offers an alternative route through a rather congested junction in art historical scholarship – the transition from the modern to the postmodern, the avant-garde to the neo-avant-garde.⁵⁹ Rather than inflaming well-rehearsed anxieties about the ubiquity and salience of ‘neos’ or ‘posts’, Freeman’s erotohistoriography provides another way of thinking about returns at mid-century to earlier forms of cultural radicalism. Hegemonic accounts of neo-avant-gardism have tended to focus on the revival of dada and constructivism rather than surrealism. Isolating the latter’s presence and function in post-war contexts has been obviated by a number of methodological assumptions in such scholarship. Scholarship by Peter Bürger, Rosalind Krauss, Hal Foster and Benjamin Buchloh undoubtedly intersect with Freeman’s exploration of non-sequential temporalities insofar as they model a return to the aesthetic practices of the past from a point in the future.⁶⁰ And yet, for all their temporal flexibility such accounts tend to reify the historical parameters of this transition, fetishizing the avant-garde of the 1920s and the neo avant-garde of the late 1950s and early 60s, remaining wedded to a generational logic that implies one cannot be a participant in both the modern and postmodern or the historical and neo-avant-garde. The 1940s are included in these models usually only as a context for the ascendancy of abstract expressionism, which functions as the point of departure for the neo-avant-gardists of the 1950s who took exception to its formalist, medium specific and masculinist definitions of advanced art.

However, as Ford’s *View* attests, the decade was already marking a return to the outmoded forms and thematics of the historical avant-garde as alternatives to the burgeoning abstract expressionism, which would then be picked up again (third hand?) in the 1960s. Ford’s ubiquity in significant moments in avant-gardism from the 1920s to the 1970s complicates the use of generationality to model cultural change and his involvements in vanguard scenes that span more than half a century functions as a disruptive, hybridizing presence in any present he happens to appear. In Ford’s hands, the differences between the historical and neo-avant-gardes are determined not so much vis-à-vis a stance towards modernism, trauma or the gallery per se but are figured as collapsible or recalculable; the historical avant-garde is not a fixed, known quantity but might instead be rewritten as it is invoked by its successors. Its continued capacity to surprise, to irritate and to disrupt inheres in the occulted queer politics and the disavowed queer social spaces and practices to which it owed visibility and influence. These not so much demand to be written into cultural history as prompt a palpable pressure on the methods of historical accounting itself.

Mr No. 1 Surrealist

In the posters, the currency of the past is, in part, determined by its continued capacity to titillate and prompt speculation, a marker of what exceeds and has been disavowed by the legible evidence of the official record, which has consigned surrealism to the history books and recorded only the evidence of its heteronormative erotics. Unfixing the past of surrealism and exploring the frustrations of premature obsolescence are exploited in one the Poem Posters, written to or by 'Mr No. 1 Surrealist', who speaks as an embodied individual with fleshly, queer desires [Fig. 7]. There is no visual representation of Breton in the work. He has instead been replaced by a body double; an imposter, impersonator or interlocutor perhaps. Breton is no longer a stable referent for the mantle 'Mr No. 1 Surrealist', which functions not as a proper name but instead as an identity type, available or amenable to the aspirations, possibly artistic but definitely erotic, of others. Even his impersonator might have been unrecognizable to many. Dark glasses conceal his eyes and his appearance, in Ford's words, as a 'junkie transvestite' would have been contrary to the figure's public persona. The man's identity is revealed in the subtitle of the work: *I WOULD LIKE TO CHANGE MY SEX AS I CHANGE MY SHIRT*" – ANDRE BRETON (*a poem for Philip Lamantia*) (an aphoristic phrase that *View* magazine had quoted and attributed to Breton in a 1943 issue).⁶¹ Lamantia had been a sixteen-year old poet from California who had approached Breton to join his circle of surrealist exiles, but quickly ingratiated himself with Ford and Tyler, later working as part of the editorial team on *View*. His declaration of fidelity to surrealism in *VVV* as well as his frequent publication in *View* cemented Lamantia as America's foremost surrealist poet during the 1940s.⁶² Lamantia parted acrimoniously from Ford and Tyler and after leaving New York in 1944, and his interest in surrealism was paused until he picked it up again in 1967. At the time of the *Poem Posters* show Lamantia would likely have been recognised, if at all, for his past involvement in an outmoded movement that was by 1965, it might seem, already history.

Surrealism may not have had much currency in avant-garde circles in the mid-1960s but its stock appears high in certain erotic ones. Lamantia is depicted wearing a bra-top and what looks like some studded briefs, stockings or thigh-high boots, with bare torso and arms on show. His head is tilted to one side with mouth part-open and his left hand is tied to a point high off-screen. Breton's eponymous desire to change his shirt in order to change sex seems rather quaint when contrasted with Lamantia's lack of shirt, which contributes to the performance of a sexual identity that (to those outside Ford's circle, at least) would not have been recognisable as his own. Ford is clearly poking fun at Breton's intractable homophobia and comparatively tame concessions to gender mutability, but he is also interrogating Breton's 'authority' over the surrealist movement. Far from in control of the movement Breton has been substituted by a 'junkie transvestite' who

seems to be invoking surrealism not as an historical avant-garde, intent on social and political transformation, but as an identity to be bought or sold in a sexual economy. The ‘advanced SWITCHING equipment’ mentioned in the poem, and foregrounded visually as a button centre-left of the poster, alludes to the increased availability of sexual, artistic and gender identities that can be performed, bought or sold in the spectacle that has penetrated not only the social but the artistic and erotic lives of its subjects.

The poem presents surrealism as undoubtedly under threat of erasure, but it is only ‘on the brink of obliteration’ and the poster seems to be both job advertisement for Mr No. 1 Surrealist (‘help wanted’, the poem reads) and personal-ad for someone claiming to be him or selling himself as such. Surrealism, it seems, is soliciting for custom, companionship or personnel. Whether Mr No. 1 Surrealist is a vacancy that needs to be filled or a moniker for someone seeking sexual gratification, he definitely likes leather and light bondage. The tethered hand implies that writing or drawing automatically could prove difficult so instead he ‘re/members automatically’. The line break in the middle of the word, with the next line reading ‘fantastic help wanted’, conflates fantasising about surrealism’s history with repopulating it, and the sexual connotations of ‘member’ invoke a phallic eroticism. Surrealism is here being re-tooled, re-membered in a distinctly queer erotic economy.

The poster suggests that surrealism’s presence in the present may not be just as a commodified, erotic identity, condemned to tout its wares alongside the advertising and promotional rhetoric for other forms of belonging, lifestyle choices and sexual practices. The realignment of its erotic capital may not necessarily be dependent on a depletion of its symbolic. The second stanza of the poem questions the misrepresentations and disingenuity that often accompany the self-promotional rhetoric germane to personal ads or job applications: ‘When you want more than the usual fake/forever’, it reads, ‘board the inward Saturn/ here ‘an authority’s known by the poetic silk/ of whatever water he shakes’. The question of authority is reduced or, perhaps more accurately, elevated to a non sequitur that is ambiguously raised in relief from the other collaged words of the poem that are otherwise semantically coherent. Juxtaposed to the incongruous detritus and shrapnel of contemporary visual and print culture, the last line, a palpable surreal image, still stands apart, reinforced by the continuous strip of white background behind the final five words which blocks them off and lends them a paradoxical coherence and distinctiveness. A ‘fake’ may be usual or unusual; there are qualitative differences between them, and surrealism is still distinguishable from the very tropes and practices of commercial culture that were said to have drained and eclipsed it. The movement might yet resonate in the future not only through the remodelling of its sexual economy but through the ‘poetic silk’ of its adherents’

production, through a continuation of what it had pledged itself from the start: the spark generated between the incongruous, the hitherto discrete. Ford stated in 1987 that the collage aesthetic best characterises his later work, adding that ‘most collage is surreal because it’s taking two elements which are usually disparate and making them one’.⁶³ The *Poem Posters* revive this dialectical account of surrealist collage, adding a different inflection to the line from Lautréamont’s *Les Chants de Maldoror* so generative of theorisations of the surrealist image that writes of ‘a boy as beautiful as ... the chance encounter of a sewing machine and an umbrella on a dissecting table!’ The chance encounters depicted and solicited in the image pertain to incongruous members whose congruency is, perhaps, ‘more than the usual fake’. The poster is not just about removing or switching shirts, but about spinning new surrealist silk; it is not so much rewriting the movement’s past as recovering and reconnecting suppressed, latent ones that are part of the tissue to which the present is incontrovertibly stitched.

The utmost in BANG!

Another of Ford’s poem posters interrogates the erotic and gender identities of the ‘historical’ avant-garde by anachronistically reprising it in the contemporary climate of sexual ‘excess’. Titled *Rose Selavy as Pope Joan* the work invokes Duchamp’s alter ego who, by taking up the role of the mythical pope of the middle-ages purported to be a woman in papal attire, is the subject of performance rather than its object. In one version of the poster, Duchamp’s face appears as a collaged fragment which peers out from a hole in the print’s surface, but in another it is Duchamp as Rose Selvy, taken from the *Belle Haleine* bottle that had featured on the cover of *New York Dada* magazine (1921) [Figs. 8, 9 and 10]. Rose wears both a mitre and a feathered show-girl headdress but little else. Her face appears atop a naked female body, imaged from behind, who adopts a clichéd strip-tease pose with back arched and legs in a half-squat.

The poster also references Duchamp’s *The Bride Stripped Bare by Her Bachelors, Even* (1915-23) or the *Large Glass*. The nine malic molds, the bachelors, appear in the centre of the collage, tilted slightly to the left. The muted yellows, greens and browns of the *Large Glass* have been replaced by the poster’s lurid palette of magenta and yellow and, unlike the *Large Glass* which is bisected horizontally, the poster is divided vertically. Previously inhabiting separate sections of the glass (in fact, according to Duchamp’s notes in the *Green Box*, inhabiting different spatial dimensions), the Bride in the poster – the Rose/Joan/showgirl figure – appears in the same half as the bachelors. Inviting comparisons to peep holes, the left half of the poster resembles cheese, with one of the holes shaped like a key hole. This invokes the back cover of the *First Papers of Surrealism* catalogue (1942), designed by Duchamp, which featured emmental cheese and included

on a page inside the cover the names of all the participants in the show arranged in the shape of key-hole. David Hopkins has connected the back cover to the nine ejaculatory shots fired by the bachelors that are denoted by nine holes in the top of the *Large Glass*, a resonance that Ford's Poster seems to exploit.⁶⁴

As Amelia Jones has shown, beginning in the mid-sixties, Duchamp's practice was revived by a cohort of artists and critics eager for alternatives to autonomous high modernism, who mobilised his ready-mades as proto-conceptualist gestures which interrogated the institutional and linguistic frames around the designation of the art object.⁶⁵ Taking issue with their instantiation of Duchamp as 'inseminator' of postmodernism within a patrilineal family tree of twentieth century art, even as the movement was born of a critique of origin, she delineates a different Duchampian legacy. Jones, and scholarship written in her wake, has explored how his interrogations of sexual and gendered identity through, for instance, his alter-ego Rose Selway and the *Large Glass* proved to be reference points for queer and/or feminist artists such as Robert Gober, Hannah Wilke, and Marcel Dzama, a list to which Ford's name needs also to be added.⁶⁶

This queerer Duchamp has become a veritable mainstay of scholarship on the artist and is often negatively contrasted to the homophobic Breton, who has fared much less favourably following the revaluation of surrealism's gender and sexual politics in research of the past couple of decades.⁶⁷ Ford's practice, however, does not cast them in the roles of hero and villain respectively, as representatives of fixed points on a spectrum of progressive sexual politics, any more than he adheres to the generational logic of the family tree which establishes Duchamp as patriarch. Instead Ford establishes a kind of equivalency between the two figureheads for surrealism; their identities sometimes interchangeable, and their attitudes towards desire, shifting and recalculable. Duchamp as Pope Joan may for certain audiences have also referenced Breton whom, Ford disclosed in an interview, 'Pavlik [Tchelitchew] used to call ... Pope Joan'.⁶⁸ Similarly, as will be explained, Duchamp's collaged face on the poster recalls Breton's on Duchamp's cover for his volume of poems *Young Cherry Trees Secured Against Hares*, published by View editions in 1946 [Fig. 11]. Breton is invoked not solely for the sake of negative or ironic contrast, and neither is Duchamp invoked solely for uncritical celebration.

The poster, then, revives Ford's fascination with Duchamp's practice that dated to at least the *View* days. *View* published a special issue celebrating Duchamp in March 1945 which, as Hopkins has observed, was instrumental in mobilising Duchamp's work in the 1940s and, as Michael Taylor specifies, demarcated a queer space for the circulation of his practice.⁶⁹ Ford was later quite insistent that Duchamp 'was definitely a surrealist after being a Dadaist', an affiliation that his publication laboured to substantiate.⁷⁰ The special issue was most the expensive and most

successful number in the magazine's history and it was also, Ford suggested, the 'first monograph ever on Duchamp', adding elsewhere, 'he was a forgotten man. And then of course, life takes him up like a new discovery. And he has become the cult hero of our time'.⁷¹

The first page of this lavish and extensive treatment of Duchamp's career featured a poem by Ford, 'Flag of Ecstasy', printed over Man Ray's *Dust Breeding* (1920), a time-lapse photograph of dust moving on sections of the *Large Glass*. The poem lists a string of surreal images telling of excess, despair, frustration and destruction, over which its final line exhorts 'Marcel wave!'⁷² Duchamp seems to preside 'Over the towers of autoerotic honey... Over the rattlesnake sexlessness of art-lovers ... over signs foretelling the end of the world / Over signs foretelling the beginning of a world', his flag of ecstasy presented by Ford as though it were a beacon of constancy amidst the vicissitudes of western (cultural) history.⁷³ *View* had been anything but a sexless publication ('a phallus leering from every other page' ran one sensationalist, and sadly inaccurate, comment in the *Kenyon Review*), but in the very sexy art world of 1965, Ford and Duchamp's longstanding shared interest in eroticism is no longer only acknowledgeable in a sly, silent wave.⁷⁴ Duchamp's banner of ecstasy flies at full mast. The dust seems to have been scraped off the *Large Glass*, and Rose Sélavy, who captioned the original photograph of *Dust Breeding* when it was published in *Literature* (1922) with 'behold the domain of rose selavy – how arid it is – how fertile – how joyous. How sad!', has been afforded new opportunities in the oasis of the 1960s carnival of sex.⁷⁵

Duchamp/Rose's face, the only collaged fragment not incorporated into the screen printed surface in any of the posters seems directly reminiscent of Duchamp's cover design for Breton's volume of poetry, *Young Cherry Trees Secured Against Hares*, released by *View* editions in 1946. Duchamp cut out the face from a photo of Statue of Liberty, through which Breton's appeared from the first page of the book. In Ford's poster, Duchamp/Rose is aligned with the leader of surrealism who is yet again substituted by someone else. Duchamp's cover has been variously interpreted as a sly dig at Breton's homophobia, his feminised appearance, his failure to embody the ideals of liberty which he preached, as well as his unsuccessful attempt to transplant his movement in America by drawing an ironic comparison between republicanism and surrealism.⁷⁶ Parker Tyler supplied another way of thinking about the image. 'With his splendid, lucid bearing, his quenchless look of intellect', he writes, 'this incarnation of Surrealism strikes me as strangely archaic ... a kind of modernism in eternal arrestment'.⁷⁷ His reading finds echoes in Freeman's notion of temporal drag, the suggestion that performativity might not be solely about gender but about time as well, or as she puts it, performativity can denote 'an excess ... of the signifier "history" rather than of "woman" or "man"'.⁷⁸ Far from the vanguard artist, ahead of

time, Breton is here ironically monumentalised as the kind of grand homme who had been celebrated in the pantheons of the Third Republic, or more accurately, as the grand damme whose most recent contribution to American patriotism was to promote the sale of war bonds. But the gesture also invites other fantasised pre-histories for the movement, prompting Tyler to envision Breton as ‘a sole survivor of a lost but very advanced civilization’.⁷⁹ Being cast in metal means Breton never grows old; he represents a modernism fixed, but also deferred. These tensions in the collaged cover dissipate when the reader opens the book to find a black and white photo of Breton’s face, neck and uppers shoulders clad in modern attire [Fig. 12]. Colour has been added to the photo, as though it were a rectified-ready made, in the form of small red dots on branches behind him. It seems as though Breton is standing in front of a tree blossoming in spring. Hopkins reads the cover image as evidence that Duchamp ‘clearly perceived Breton’s enterprise as sunk’, a reading that is challenged by consideration of the full photo of Breton on the next page with its allusions to renewal and fecundity. Ford revisits Duchamp’s design nearly 20 years later in the poster, furthering its suggestion that being consigned to history is not something that happens once and neither is it irrevocable.⁸⁰

The poster, then, references the frustrations of, and release from, eternal arrestment explored in Duchamp’s cover and connects it to his more celebrated and elaborate exploration of interminable frustration, the *Large Glass*, which was prioritised in the special issue of *View*. Duchamp’s *Cemetery of Uniforms and Liveries No. 2* (1914), captioned the ‘moules malic’, appears on the introductory page of the publication, facing Ford’s poem ‘The Flag of Ecstasy’ and immediately preceding Breton’s ‘The Lighthouse of the Bride’. The interactive middle-section of the special issue, designed by Duchamp and Frederick Kiesler featured an innovative tryptic which included reproductions of *Fresh Window* and photographs of Duchamp in his studio, but focussed on the *Large Glass* by inviting the reader to assemble different versions of the work. In one permutation, the bachelors appear as though held in a print of Duchamp’s left hand in white paint, extracting them from the heterosexual economy to which they were connected in the original work and emphasising the onanistic labour in which they, and perhaps now their creator and audience, partake [Fig. 13]. Another combination of the work presents the bachelors alongside the rest of the apparatus in the lower half of the *Glass* connected to just the wrist of the handprint, which together, according to the notes, ‘assume the shape of the “livreur de grand magasin” one of the moules malic’. That Duchamp and Kiesler should have chosen ‘the department store delivery boy’ of all the nine bachelors is perhaps a comment on *View*’s embrace of consumption, connecting it to the *Large Glass*’s own resemblance to a shop window and its associations with the commodity.⁸¹ At the time of the publication, the *Large Glass* was in Katherine Drier’s collection and in the years

preceding the *Poem Posters* show, the work had been permanently instated at the Philadelphia Museum of Art in 1954, Richard Hamilton had begun his project to remake the work as well as translating, with George Heard Hamilton, the notes in *The Green Box* in 1960.⁸² Its stock was, then, rising in the 1960s but Ford's Poem Poster mobilises *Vien's* presentation of the work, recalling its focus on the bachelors extracted from a heterosexual economy and emphasis on how the work might be disaggregated and unfixed from its encasement with precision accuracy in the *Large Glass* itself.

Rrose Selavy as Pope Joan seems initially to be an ironic reference to the *Large Glass*, whose convoluted mechanical manifestation of the frustration of desire is contrasted with the climate of sexual permissiveness in the 1960s. The bride from the *Large Glass*, 'the apotheosis of virginity' who is never morphologically recognisable as naked since she is a projection of a three dimensional form in four dimensions, is in the poster very much stripped bare.⁸³ What was once illegible seems fully tangible in the carnival of sexual excess staged in the poster. It is not just the bride who is afforded a recognisably female body, but the impossible female bodies of Rrose and Joan are also granted and revealed. 'Time for Fiery ending', reads the poem, announcing 'the utmost in BANG!' Duchamp writes in the notes of the possibility that the Bride has company, that 'the maiden's attachment to her girlfriends and relatives' might be simulated.⁸⁴ In Ford's version, Rrose and Joan function as her companions, constituting a sisterhood who have usurped modernist authorship and papal authority and are now stripping for themselves, of their 'own bride[s]-desiring'.⁸⁵

And yet, of course, Ford's poster still only features an 'impossible' female body. The naked body of Rrose/Joan/the Bride is a collaged fragment of an anonymous female performer, adopting a fetishised, clichéd pose of heterosexual desirability. Rrose and Joan appropriate this 'body', which is as much a signifier of a particular classed and raced femininity as the feather headdress and Rrose's make-up and hairstyle. The body is not the abjected 'real' body behind the drag performance, but instead owes its visibility to its conformance with the specular codes of heterosexual eroticism. As a projection of something three-dimensional into the fourth dimension, the body of the bride in the *Glass* was unintelligible, or, as Duchamp put it, 'immensurable', but the poster makes visible the codes of mensurability in this new context.⁸⁶ It denaturalises not only the gendered body but the sexed body, whose currency and coherence is rendered a function of its capacity to meet the fetishizing and commodifying gaze of patriarchal heterosexuality.

This is not to say, however, that the transhistorical, bi-gendered figure does not issue a challenge to this gaze or these erotics. It mobilizes a collective performance, in Judith Butler's terms, of simultaneously "being" and "having" the phallus.⁸⁷ The same body performs and parodies phallic authority (through the depiction of the mitre and Rrose's authorial agency), as well

as exposing the threat posed to it by the castrating power of the 'naked' female body, and the poster exaggerates the processes of fetishism and voyeurism through which this threat is ameliorated. As Butler writes 'that being and having can be confounded, upsets the logic of non-contradiction that serves the either-or of normative heterosexual exchange'.⁸⁸

The composite body of Rose/Joan/The Bride registers and confounds not only the logic of non-contradiction between the heterosexual coding of the identities 'man' and 'woman', but the customary non-congruency between 'now' and 'then'. Her body aligns history as the practice of masculinist power with its linear record of activities. Rose's anachronistic re-performance of Joan's performance of papal authority delivers a history lesson, or rather a lesson in historiography, that not so much augments our knowledge of the middle ages or instates Joan as historical 'origin' of drag performance, as prompt a different kind of reflection. It invites consideration of which other historical figures of masculine authority throughout the ages may have harboured secrets beneath their robes, armour and crowns, cuing speculation on what historiography might look like if it did not prioritise external signifiers of masculinist power as the locus of historical enquiry and instead recognized that assertions of historical 'fact' are every bit as performative as the gendered identities it transmutes into constative claims about sex. The poster's erotohistoriography attends to legend, gossip and the vernacular – as well as modernist art – through which other forms of embodiment, desire or power, occulted by the equation of the male body with political, cultural or religious authority, have been given expression.

The malic molds, the bachelors, or 'eros matrix' as *View* captioned them, can never get naked; they can never perform 'nakedness'. There is no body inside the empty liveries of the priest, department-store delivery boy, gendarme, cuirassier, policeman, undertaker, flunkey, busboy and station master. On this, Duchamp was insistent. 'It's the inside I didn't want to show',⁸⁹ he writes, adding in the notes, '*they* will never be able to pass beyond the Mask'.⁹⁰ There is not even the possibility that a Rose or Joan may be concealed underneath, since the molds are empty. They are free-floating, marooned in the middle of the poster and, crucially, disconnected from the Bride. The capillary tubes that linked the bachelors, via the sieves, chocolate grinder and occult witnesses in the *Large Glass* are missing. Their absence is alluded to by an area of white paint that connects Rose's head to the 'naked' body, part of which forms the indexical mark of a grasping hand in profile whose fingers are congruent with the *Network of Stoppages* (1914), themselves isomorphic with the *Three Standard Stoppages* (1913), which provided the template for the capillary tubes in the *Large Glass*. The bachelors are not so much frustrated in but delivered from their participation in a heterosexual economy. They perform their phallic potency for no one other than themselves. 'Men look at' reads an emboldened line from the poem, directing the gaze of the bachelors away

from the Bride, towards the left hand section of the poster, with its echoes of the nine ejaculatory shots.

Now that they are no longer responsible for fuelling the Bride's stripping, the bachelors have inched a little closer together. The laws of perspective which had governed their carefully plotted position, according to a 'grim determinism', in the lower half of the *Large Glass* have been overruled.⁹¹ Their onanistic activity is recast in queerer and more social terms, as they seem to have eeked back some collective agency and autonomy. The delay in glass has itself been delayed. The touch of bodies that had been arrested in the glass through the laws of perspective and solidity of the material is now permitted. Ford's poster hyperbolically exaggerates the thwarting of heterosexual desire to the point that it is no longer catered for in the machinery of the *Large Glass*. The 'utmost in BANG!' is palpable not so much through the extra inches of female flesh on display but the millimetres travelled by the uniformed bachelors through the glass. The erotics of art history are recalculable, it seems, even if the conditions of visibility of women's bodies in a fetishistic, heterosexual economy might not be. The *Large Glass* is not invoked ironically or negatively as a superseded work of early modernism, but is instead cast as a site of renovation, a space affording new bodily encounters; in fact, the site of multiple regenerations, since *Rose as Pope Joan* compels a recognition of *View*'s intervention into the queer currency of Duchamp's seminal work some twenty years earlier than the poster, but some twenty years after the *Large Glass* was finished.

Wish you were here

View continued to inform and incite Ford's practice in the following decade and serves as a context for framing the reception of surrealism well beyond the 1960s. Ford curated part of *The Page as Alternative Space* show at the Franklin Furnace Gallery in 1979–80; his section featured *View*, *Minotaure*, surrealist exhibition catalogues, manuscripts and postcards as significant venues for modernist activity 1930–1949. His "Having Wonderful Time Wish You Were Here": Postcards to Charles Henri Ford exhibition at the Iolas Gallery, New York, in April 1976 consisted of 108 postcards and photographs sent to him by friends and acquaintances between 1936 and 1976, ranging from Leonora Carrington to Ed Ruscha, Benjamin Peret to John Lennon and Yoko Ono. The promotional text for the show penned by Jeremiah Weston, titled 'La Mode Retro', describes Ford as a 'Time-traveler/poet', and notes that '[m]any of the contributors to *View* are represented in this postcard exhibition'.⁹²

The postcard had long been a reference point in both surrealist practice and its reception. Georges Hugnet had issued *The Guaranteed Postcard* series in 1937, a collection of 21 reproductions

of previously unpublished artworks or objects in sepia by artists such as Picasso, Breton, Duchamp, Man Ray and Meret Oppenheim, and *View* had itself released three series of postcards in 1946 and 7, featuring reproductions of artworks included in the magazine, one of which, an image of bull by Picasso, was reprised as the promotional image for Ford's film *Johnny Minotaur* [Figs. 14 and 15]. In 1945 Greenberg had indicted surrealist painting in 1944 as merely 'copying the effects of the calendar reproduction, postal card chromeotype and magazine illustration', and it is tempting to read the *View* series as a parodic realisation and critique of Greenberg's description of surrealist production.⁹³ Rather than confusing distinctions between 'original' and reproduction, some thirty years later Ford's postcard show drew on the postcard to complicate distinctions between the deictic markers, here and there, now and then, you and me, which are equally as embedded in formalist, linear approaches to modernism. The show reprises the humble postcard as a trace of places visited and people known and by privileging the reverse of the postcard as the site of inscription from a friend, colleague or lover it functions not as a reproduction of an already non-auratic image but as an indexical sign of a once present body thinking of another. The initials and scrawls on the postcard function as surrogates for the more customary presence of the artist's signature in the gallery space, and curatorial labour is recast as a tacit function of trans-generational networks of friendship, desire, business and love.

By 1976, mail art had perhaps already reached its zenith; Ford was once again laying claim to a position behind the curve, introducing outmoded surrealist practices into a different context that was itself on the wane. Operating ostensibly under an open submission policy, Ray Johnson's large-scale 'New York Correspondence School Exhibition', for instance, at the Whitney in 1970 invited would-be contributors to send postcards for exhibit, offering, according to John Held, 'a momentary glimpse into a transitory realm, flowing like a river and as difficult to capture'.⁹⁴ Johnson's show sought to create new, ephemeral networks but Ford's exhibition, both retrospective and prospective, was in part about resuscitating old ones, turning to the postcard in the archive as much as soliciting those as yet un-sent. It functions, then, following Freeman as a kind of erotohistoriography of the avant-garde, one that renders the avant-garde's history as coterminous with, and a function of, Ford's lengthy friendships and relationships. It explores the spatial and temporal dislocation inherent in any epistolary medium but it stretches and interrogates the medium further. The rhetoric surrounding the show exploits not only the correspondence between sender and recipient but the correspondences of multiple different subject positions.

'Wish you were here' reads the promotional postcard, in Ford's near illegible handwriting, mimicking the clichéd inscription on countless postcards [Fig. 16]. If read as reported speech, the deictic marker 'here' draws backwards to the heterogeneous points of production of the postcards,

but as uttered by Ford it also reaches forward to their display in the gallery. Similarly, the deictic pronoun 'you' might be filled by Ford as recipient of the cards but it also interpolates the gallery's future audiences. Like 'modern' (and 'surrealism', one might add) to return to that promotional advert for *Vien*, 'here' and 'you' are contextually dependent, filled in multiple locations by multiple incumbents. 'Having wonderful time' seems to open up a space which fosters and promotes the correspondence both between and of artists, curators, friends and audiences, yielding a model of temporality, so apt in its summation of Ford's practice and career, that can only be quantified or qualified in terms of the personal and erotic friendships it sustains.

Wonderful Time

Ford's continual returns to surrealism cast temporal and spatial disjuncture as internal to the movement's history, as well as both disruptive and generative of it. This is, perhaps, 'the prehistoric paradox' of which, one poster notes, Mr No. 1 Surrealist is 'the gaudy executive'. Trafficking in anachronism or being trafficked as anachronistic garnered its incumbents experience in, and authority over, temporal dissidence. Collage enabled one such irruption of the non-synchronous in surrealism, and in Ford's *Poem Posters*, surrealism provides not only the form but the content for the collage aesthetic; it supplies, then, the syntax through which both its history as conventionally told is disrupted and its status *as* the outmoded, as history, is unfixed. That Ford's collages should mobilise a queer surrealist subject position connects the destabilisation of its past to a refiguring of its sexual politics, both gestures which are apparently proper to or licensed by surrealism itself. Duchamp's experiments with the bricolage of gender performativity are reworked by Ford so that surrealism is both the object of performance as well as its subject; Ford's temporal drag performance of surrealism lays bare not just the signifiers of gender and sexuality but cultural history as well. An erotohistoriography of the avant-garde exceeds the co-ordinates of the gallery, modernism and originality, around which old and new positions are customarily orientated, and instead instates embodied points of contact between them, through which surrealism's dynamic with the present is one of relationality rather than alterity. The outmoding of the outmoded does not mark an irreversible point of rupture; it is a performative declaration that paradoxically means the 'old' and the 'new', the 'past' and the 'present', are mutually constitutive, that they share the same time and space and may well have unfinished business with each other.

Acknowledgements

Most of this article was researched and written while I was a Leverhulme Early Career Fellow and I would to thank the Leverhulme Trust for this award. Additional research was also enabled through a fellowship from the Harry Ransom Center, University of Texas, Austin. I would like to thank librarians and archivists at the Getty Research Institute, Los Angeles, the Beinecke Library, Yale University, Bancroft Library, Berkeley, California, Fales Library, New York University, and Special Collections at the University of Delaware. I would also like to acknowledge the Nicolas Calas Estate, Louisiana Museum of Modern Art, Humlebaek, Denmark and Gerard Malanga for permission to quote from archival materials, and particular thanks go to Indra Tamang and Romy Ashby for generous permission to reproduce artworks by Charles Henri Ford. Thanks also go to the anonymous reviewers, and to Francesco Ventrella, for their insightful and constructive comments on an earlier draft.

¹ For literature on *View* which emphasises its differences from the ‘official’ surrealist publication during wartime, *VVV*, see Dickran Tashjian, *A Boatload of Madmen: Surrealism and the American Avant-Garde, 1920-1950*, London: 2001, Martica Sawin, *Surrealism in Exile: And the Beginning of the New York School*, Cambridge, Mass.: 1997 and Stamatina Dimakopoulou, ‘Europe in America: Remapping Broken Cultural Lines, *View* (1940-7) and *VVV* (1942-4)’, in *The Oxford Critical and Cultural History of Modernist Magazines: Volume II*, ed. Peter Brooker and Andrew Thacker, Oxford: 2012. For scholarship which explores its queer politics see Juan Suarez, ‘View (1940-47), the Avant-Garde, and the Uncertain Life of Objects: Criticism as If Fragments Mattered’, *Miscelánea: A Journal of English and American Studies*, 18, 1997 and David Lomas, *Narcissus Reflected: The Myth of Narcissus in Surrealist and Contemporary Art*, Edinburgh: 2011.

² For an overview of this scholarship, see C. Dinshaw et al., ‘Theorizing Queer Temporalities: A Roundtable Discussion’, *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies*, 13 2-3, 2007.

³ See Alexander Howard, ‘Into the 1930s: *Troubadour* (1928-32); *Blues* (129-30); *Smoke* (1931-7) and *Furioso* (1939-52)’, in *The Oxford Critical and Cultural History of Modernist Magazines: Volume II: North America 1894-1960*, ed. Peter Brooker and Andrew Thacker, Oxford: 2012.

⁴ Charles Henri Ford and Parker Tyler, *The Young and Evil*, New York: 1996. See Sam See, 'Making Modernism New: Queer Mythology in the Young and Evil', *ELH* 76, 2009; Juan Suarez, 'Queer Modernism: Charles Henri Ford and Parker Tyler's *the Young and the Evil*', in *Pop Modernism: Noise and the Reinvention of the Everyday*, Champaign, IL 2007; Joseph Allen Boone, *Libidinal Currents: Sexuality and the Shaping of Modernism*, Chicago: 1998.

⁵ Louise Bogan, 'On the Poetry of Paul Eluard', *Partisan Review*, 6 5, 1939, 84.

⁶ Charles Henri Ford and Parker Tyler, 'Surrealist Protest', *ibid.* 7 1, 1940, 77.

⁷ Interview with Charles Henri Ford, Lynne Tillman and Clive Philpot, 22nd October 1980, non-paginated. In Lynne Tillman Papers, Fales Library, University of New York.

⁸ Charles Henri Ford, letter to Parker Tyler, undated (20 April, 1938?). Charles Henri Ford Papers, Harry Ransom Centre, University of Texas (Austin). He is referring to the surrealists' roundtable conversation about sex, at which a broad spectrum of non-normative sexual practices is up for discussion, save for male homosexuality, the mention of which prompts Breton to threaten to leave the room. Published in Jose Pierre, *Investigating Sex: Surrealist Research, 1928-1932*, London: 1992.

⁹ He says this in, for instance, a letter to Ted Joans, 8 October 1964. MSS 292, Charles Henri Ford letters to Ted Joans, Special Collections, University of Delaware Library, Newark, Delaware. Arguably, Ginsberg's first publication was Allen Ginsberg, 'Song: Fie My Fum', *Neurotica*, 6, 1950.

¹⁰ See for instance Ford's account in Charles Henri Ford, 'Interview With', in *The Autobiography and Sex Life of Andy Warhol*, ed. J. Wilcock, New York: 2010, 54.

¹¹ *Spare Parts*, New York: 1966; *Silver Flower Co.*, New York: 1968.

¹² For a filmic biography of Ford, which explores his many acquaintances, see James Dowell and John Kolomvakis, 'Sleep in a Nest of Flames,' (Symbiosis Films, 2001).

¹³ Charles Henri Ford to Ted Joans, 8 October 1964. He mentions in this letter that he wanted to produce posters for Cassius Clay, Jim Clark, Sarah Vaughn, Jasper Johns and Joseph Cornell, plans which never materialised.

¹⁴ Letter from Arne [Ekstrom] to Charles Henri Ford, 6 February 1965. Charles Henri Ford Papers, Harry Ransom Center.

¹⁵ Ford, 'Interview With', 62.

¹⁶ See Hal Foster, 'Death in America', *October*, 75 Winter 1996.

¹⁷ A notebook detailing working drafts of the poems, including the titles, can be found in Box 4, Folder 8 of Ford's archive at the Harry Ransom Center.

¹⁸ Letter from Arne [Ekstrom] to Charles Henri Ford, 6. February 1965. Charles Henri Ford Papers, Harry Ransom Center.

¹⁹ Letter from Nicolas Calas to Charles Henri Ford, 13 February [1965]. Charles Henri Ford Papers, Harry Ransom Center.

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ Ibid.

²² For Ford's account of this period, see Charles Henri Ford, *Water from a Bucket: A Diary, 1948-1957*, New York: 2001.

²³ See Gerard Malanga, 'Long Day's Journey into the Past: Gunnar B. Kvaran Speaks with Gerard Malanga', in *Andy Warhol by Andy Warhol*, ed. Gunnar Kvaran, Hanne Ueland, and Grete Arbu, Milan: 2008; Reva Wolf, *Andy Warhol, Poetry, and Gossip in the 1960s*, Chicago: 1997.

²⁴ Interview with Charles Henri Ford, Lynne Tillman and Clive Philpot, 22 October 1980, non-paginated.

²⁵ Letter from Charles Henri Ford to Parker Tyler, Athens, 7 February 1964. Charles Henri Ford Papers, Harry Ransom Center. Ford revives *Blues*, his little magazine from 1929-30 in 1989. See Charles Henri Ford, ed. *Unmuzzled Ox: Blues 10*, 1989.

²⁶ Letter from Charles Henri Ford to Parker Tyler, 22 July 1947. Charles Henri Ford Papers, Harry Ransom Center.

²⁷ Letter from Gerard Malanga to Charles Henri Ford 7 August 1963. Charles Henri Ford Papers, Getty Research Institute.

-
- ²⁸ Interview with Charles Henri Ford, Lynne Tillman and Clive Philpot, 22 October 1980, non-paginated. No italics in the original. See also Malanga, 'Long Day's Journey into the Past: Gunnar B. Kvaran Speaks with Gerard Malanga', 164.
- ²⁹ Parker Tyler, *The Divine Comedy of Pavel Tchelitchew*, London: 1967, 423.
- ³⁰ *The Divine Comedy of Pavel Tchelitchew*, 424.
- ³¹ John B. Myers, *Tracking the Marvelous: A Life in the New York Art World*, New York: 1983, 25.
- ³² Greenberg, 'The Renaissance of the Little Mag: Review of *Accent*, *Diogenes*, *Experimental Review*, *Vice Versa*, and *View*,' in *Greenberg: The Collected Essays and Criticism*, 42-43.
- ³³ Editorial for the *Poetry Paper* (c. 1941), in Charles Henri Ford Papers, Harry Ransom Center.
- ³⁴ Letter from Charles Henri Ford to Clem[ent] Greenberg, 6 February 1941. Charles Henri Ford Papers, Harry Ransom Center.
- ³⁵ 'Reports and Reporters', *View* 1 (Sept 1940).
- ³⁶ Robert Duncan, 'The Homosexual in Society', *Politics*, 17, August 1944, 210. See also his critique of *View*, original published in *Ark* 1 (1947) 'Reviewing View: An Attack', in *The Young Robert Duncan: Portrait of the Poet as Homosexual in Society*, ed. Eckbert Faas, Santa Barbara: 1983. Duncan was published in *View* magazine, under the name Robert Symmes.
- ³⁷ Letter from Charles Henri Ford to Parker Tyler, 13 September 1940. Charles Henri Ford Papers, Harry Ransom Center.
- ³⁸ Charles Henri Ford, 'The Charles Henri Ford Experience: An Autobiography' (1974), 25. In Charles Henri Ford Papers, Getty Research Institute, Los Angeles.
- ³⁹ Charles Henri Ford, 'Charles Henri Ford Interviewed by Ira Cohen', in *Gay Sunshine Interviews*, ed. Winston Leyland, San Francisco: 1978, 58.
- ⁴⁰ See Tashjian, *A Boatload of Madmen: Surrealism and the American Avant-Garde, 1920-1950*. Tashjian, 2001, for an overview of early exhibitions of surrealism in America.
- ⁴¹ 'Frozen Nightmares,' *Time*, 26 November, 1934.

⁴² Herbert J Muller, 'Surrealism: A Dissenting Opinion', in *New Directions 1940*, ed. James Laughlin, Norfolk, Conn.: 1940, 555. See Clement Greenberg, 'Surrealist Painting', in *Clement Greenberg: The Collected Essays and Criticism Vol 1*, ed. John O'Brian, Chicago: 1986; 'Avant-Garde and Kitsch', *Partisan Review*, VI 5, Fall 1939.

⁴³ For a sample of such anxieties, see 'Our Country and Our Culture' Symposium', *ibid.* XIX 4, 1952.

⁴⁴ 'Remembrance of Things Past,' *Time*, 21 July 1947, 29. See also Muller, 'Surrealism: A Dissenting Opinion'; Meyer Schapiro, "'Surrealist Field Day.'" Review of Surrealism, by Julian Levy', *Nation*, 23 January 1937.

⁴⁵ André Breton, 'Speech to the Students at Yale,' (1942), in *VVV* 2-3, 1943. Published as 'Situation of Surrealism between the Wars', *Yale French Studies*, 2, 1948, 67-78.

⁴⁶ Lionel Abel, 'It Is Time to Pick the Iron Rose', *VVV*, 1 June 1942.

⁴⁷ For more on postwar Parisian Surrealism, see Alyce Mahon, *Surrealism and the Politics of Eros: 1938-1968*, London: 2005; Gavin Parkinson, *Myth, Science Fiction, and Fantastic Art in France, 1936--1969*, New Haven: 2015. Parkinson. The Parisian surrealists' turn to Eros in the late 1950s and 60 chimes with Ford's *Poem Posters*, not least their survey enquiring about strip-tease, illustrated by Pierre Molinier, who was himself contributing to the increased visibility of non-normative desire within the movement; See 'Un enquete sur le strip tease', *Le Surréalisme Même*, nos. 4 and 5 (1958, 1959). However, it is the outmoded status of surrealism from which Ford makes queer erotic capital; contemporary iterations of the movement were incompatible with the politics of the non-synchronous on which his practice depended.

⁴⁸ Elizabeth Freeman, *Time Binds: Queer Temporalities, Queer Histories*, London: 2010, xiii.

⁴⁹ *Time Binds: Queer Temporalities, Queer Histories*, xxii.

⁵⁰ For more on the surrealists' mobilisation of the outmoded, see Hal Foster, *Compulsive Beauty*, Cambridge, Mass.: 1995, 157-91.

-
- ⁵¹ Walter Benjamin, 'Surrealism: The Last Snapshot of the European Intelligentsia', *New Left Review*, 108 1, 1978, 50.
- ⁵² 'Paris, the Capital of the Nineteenth Century (1935)', in *The Arcades Project*, London: 1999, 13.
- ⁵³ Freeman, *Time Binds: Queer Temporalities, Queer Histories*, 89.
- ⁵⁴ Freeman, *Time Binds: Queer Temporalities, Queer Histories*, 95.
- ⁵⁵ *Time Binds: Queer Temporalities, Queer Histories*, 95.
- ⁵⁶ Gavin Butt, *Between You and Me: Queer Disclosures in the New York Art World, 1948–1963*, London: 2005, 9.
- ⁵⁷ *Between You and Me: Queer Disclosures in the New York Art World, 1948–1963*, 7.
- ⁵⁸ Foster, *Compulsive Beauty*, 167.
- ⁵⁹ Freeman, *Time Binds: Queer Temporalities, Queer Histories*, 79.
- ⁶⁰ See Hal Foster, 'What's Neo About the Neo-Avant-Garde?', *October*, 70 The Duchamp Effect, Autumn 1994; Rosalind Krauss, *The Originality of the Avant-Garde and Other Modernist Myths*, Cambridge, Mass.: 1986; Peter Bürger, *Theory of the Avant-Garde*, Manchester: 1984; Benjamin H.D. Buchloh, *Neo-Avantgarde and Culture Industry: Essays on European and American Art from 1955 to 1975*, Cambridge, Mass.: 2003.
- ⁶¹ This is the epigraph to Man Ray's text 'Photography is not art', *View*, No 1, series 3 (1943), 23.
- ⁶² See Philip Lamantia, 'Philip Lamantia to André Breton, October 1943', *VVV*, 4 February 1944.
- ⁶³ Bruce Wolmer and Charles Henri Ford, 'Charles Henri Ford', *BOMB*, 18, 1987. 57.
- ⁶⁴ David Hopkins, 'Duchamp, Surrealism, and "Liberty": From *Dust Breeding* to *Etant Donnes*', in *Aka Marcel Duchamp: Meditations on the Identities of an Artist*, ed. A.C. Goodyear and J.W. McManus, Washington D.C.: 2014, 66-67.
- ⁶⁵ Amelia Jones, *Postmodernism and the En-Gendering of Marcel Duchamp*, New York: 1994.
- ⁶⁶ See for instance, David Hopkins, 'Duchamp's Legacy: The Rauschenberg-Johns Axis', in *After Modern Art, 1945-2000*, Oxford: 2000; 'Re-Thinking the Duchamp Effect', in *A Companion to*

Contemporary Art since 1945, ed. Amelia Jones, Malden, Mass.: 2006; Michael Taylor, *Marcel Duchamp: Etant Donnes*, Philadelphia: 2009, 197-227.

⁶⁷ For a sample of scholarship on queer Duchamp, some of which draws unfavourable comparisons to Breton, see Giovanna Zapperi, 'Marcel Duchamp's *Tonsure*: Towards an Alternate Masculinity', *Oxford Art Journal*, 30 2, 2007; Robert Harvey, 'Where's Duchamp?: Out Queering the Field', *Yale French Studies*, 109, 2006; Paul B. Franklin, 'Object Choice: Marcel Duchamp's *Fountain* and the Art of Queer Art History', *Oxford Art Journal*, 23 1, 2000; Michael Taylor, 'Hieronymus Duchamp', in *Aka Marcel Duchamp*, ed. Anne Collins Goodyear and James W McManus, Washington DC: 2014; Hopkins, 'Duchamp, Surrealism, and "Liberty": From *Dust Breeding* to *Etant Donnes*'.

⁶⁸ Ford, 'Charles Henri Ford Interviewed by Ira Cohen', 47. Pavlik was a nickname Ford used for Tchelitchew.

⁶⁹ Hopkins, 'Duchamp, Surrealism, and "Liberty": From *Dust Breeding* to *Etant Donnes*' and Taylor, 'Hieronymus Duchamp'.

⁷⁰ Ford, 'Charles Henri Ford Interviewed by Ira Cohen', 54.

⁷¹ Interview with Charles Henri Ford, Lynne Tillman and Clive Philpot, 22nd October 1980, non-paginated.

⁷² A Marcel wave is a women's hairstyle, using hot irons to make curls. Thanks to James Boaden for bringing this to my attention. John Myers notes that Ford may have been making a reference to Duchamp's New York studio on Fourteenth Street, which was over a beauty parlour. See Myers, *Tracking the Marvelous: A Life in the New York Art World*, 33.

⁷³ Charles Henri Ford, 'Flag of Ectasy', *View*, 2 5, 1945.

⁷⁴ Niel Glixon, 'Review: Figure, Carpet, and Whole Cloth', *Kenyon Review*, 12 2, 1950.

⁷⁵ *Littérature*, No. 5, Paris, 1 October, 1922.

⁷⁶ David Hopkins, 'The Politics of Equivocation: Sherrie Levine, Duchamp's "Compensation Portrait", and Surrealism in the USA 1942-45', *Oxford Art Journal*, 26 1, 2005; T.J. Demos, *Exiles of*

Marcel Duchamp, Cambridge, Mass.: 2012; Hopkins, 'Duchamp, Surrealism, and "Liberty": From *Dust Breeding* to *Etant Donnes*'.

⁷⁷ Tyler, *The Divine Comedy of Pavel Tchelitchew*, 428-9.

⁷⁸ Freeman, *Time Binds: Queer Temporalities, Queer Histories*, 62.

⁷⁹ Tyler, *The Divine Comedy of Pavel Tchelitchew*, 429.

⁸⁰ Hopkins, 'Duchamp, Surrealism, and "Liberty": From *Dust Breeding* to *Etant Donnes*', 65.

⁸¹ See David Joselit, *Infinite Regress: Marcel Duchamp, 1910-1941*, Cambridge, Mass.: 2001, 137-42.

⁸² See also Jonathan D. Katz, 'Dada's Mama: Richard Hamilton's Queer Pop', *Art History*, 35 2, 2012.

⁸³ Marcel Duchamp, *The Essential Writings of Marcel Duchamp*, ed. Michel Sanouillet and Elmer Peterson, London: 1975, 39.

⁸⁴ *The Essential Writings of Marcel Duchamp*, 42.

⁸⁵ *The Essential Writings of Marcel Duchamp*, 42.

⁸⁶ See *The Essential Writings of Marcel Duchamp*, 44. And Joselit, *Infinite Regress: Marcel Duchamp, 1910-1941*, 9-70.

⁸⁷ Judith Butler, *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of "Sex"*, New York: 2014, 63.

⁸⁸ *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of "Sex"*, 88.

⁸⁹ Pierre Cabanne, *Dialogues with Marcel Duchamp*, New York: 2009, 49.

⁹⁰ Duchamp, *The Essential Writings of Marcel Duchamp*, 51. Emphasis in original.

⁹¹ Calvin Tomkins, *Duchamp: A Biography*, New York: 2014, 6.

⁹² Jeremiah Weston, 'La Mode Retro', 1979. In Charles Henri Ford Papers, Getty Institute.

⁹³ Greenberg, 'Surrealist Painting', 229.

⁹⁴ John Jr. Held, 'The Mail Art Exhibition: Personal Worlds to Cultural Strategies', in *At a Distance: Precursors to Art and Activism on the Internet*, ed. A. Chandler and N. Neumark, Cambridge, Mass.: 2005, 96.